

## Tilburg University

### Sequential bifurcation for observations with random errors

Bettonvil, B.W.M.

*Publication date:*  
1989

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bettonvil, B. W. M. (1989). *Sequential bifurcation for observations with random errors*. (Research memorandum / Tilburg University, Department of Economics; Vol. FEW 382). Unknown Publisher.

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CBM  
R



UNIVERSITEIT  
BRABANT

7626  
1989  
382

POSTBOX 90153  
5000 LE TILBURG  
THE NETHERLANDS



\* C I N O 1 4 1 3 \*



CBM

R

7626

1989

382

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS  
RESEARCH MEMORANDUM



SEQUENTIAL BIFURCATION FOR OBSERVA-  
TIONS WITH RANDOM ERRORS

Bert Bettonvil

FEW 382

FEW 382  
31777

march 1989

# SEQUENTIAL BIFURCATION FOR OBSERVATIONS WITH RANDOM ERRORS

Bert Bettonvil

Tilburg University/Eindhoven University of Technology

P O Box 90153

5000 LE Tilburg

Netherlands

Sequential Bifurcation is a method for factor screening, which is proven to be very efficient in case of observations without random errors. In this paper the method is extended to observations with random errors. The signal-to-noise ratio is taken as a measure of "importance". By means of Monte Carlo experiments the power, significance and number of observations are investigated.

Keywords: Experimental Design, Screening, Aggregated Variables, Binary Search, Simulation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We focus on problems with a great many (100,1000,10000?) input variables, out of which only a few are really important. A straightforward screening method would use at least as many observations as there are variables to be inspected. But an observation can be so time-consuming, that collecting so many data is prohibitive. Also see Kleijnen (1987).

We represent the model as a linear regression (meta) model. By imposing one special restriction we can reduce the number of runs. We consider the first-order (main effects) model

$$y(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N, e) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_N x_N + e, \quad (1.1)$$

in which we assume non-negative effects only:  $\beta_l \geq 0$  ( $l=1, \dots, N$ ), and in which we assume for convenience that  $N$  is a power of two ( $N=2^m$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ). To estimate a first-order model, a two-level experiment suffices; so we may take  $x_l \in \{0,1\}$  for  $l=1, \dots, N$ . In previous papers (Bettonvil 1988a,b,c) we developed a method, called Sequential Bifurcation or "SB", to handle the case of no errors:  $e=0$ . At present we shall treat the case  $e \sim \text{NID}(0, \sigma^2)$ , where  $\text{NID}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  stands for normally independently distributed with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ . We assume  $\sigma^2$  to be known (in a future paper we shall drop this assumption). We want to find all "important" factors, calling a factor important, iff its regression parameter is large. In the error-free case, we called a regression parameter "large", iff it is greater than some given number  $\delta \geq 0$ ; in case of errors ( $\sigma^2 > 0$ ) a regression parameter is called large, iff it is greater than  $\delta\sigma$ , with  $\delta$  some given positive number.

SB for observations without random error is described in a condensed way in section 2. Section 3 is the main part of this paper; here we introduce random error, propose an adaption of SB, and present results from Monte Carlo experiments. Our findings are summarized in section 4.

## 2. SEQUENTIAL BIFURCATION FOR OBSERVATIONS WITHOUT ERRORS

In this section, we give a brief description of Sequential Bifurcation in case the observations have no errors:  $e=0$  in (1.1). For an extensive description, we refer to Bettonvil(1988c).

Sequential Bifurcation is a group screening method. The groups it considers are: first (in "stage 0") one group of size  $N=2^m$ , next (in stage 1) two groups of size  $N/2=2^{m-1}$  each, then (in stage 2) four groups of size  $N/4=2^{m-2}$  each, and so on. In general, in stage  $j$  ( $j=0,1,\dots,m$ ) SB considers  $2^j$  groups of size  $N/2^j=2^{m-j}$  each. In stage  $m$ , we have  $2^m=N$  groups of size  $2^{m-m}=1$ : we have reached the individual factors. The sum of the parameters in the  $k^{\text{th}}$  group at stage  $j$  ( $k=1,2,\dots,2^j$ ;  $j=0,1,\dots,m$ ) is called the aggregated effect of this group, or "the  $k^{\text{th}}$  parameter at stage  $j$ ". It is denoted by  $\beta_{k|j}$  and defined as

$$\beta_{k|j} := \sum_{\ell=(k-1)*2^{m-j}+1}^{k*2^{m-j}} \beta_{\ell} \quad (j=0,1,\dots,m; k=1,2,\dots,2^j), \quad (2.1)$$

where ":@" means "is defined as". A direct consequence of (2.1) is

$$\beta_{k|j} = \beta_{2k-1|j+1} + \beta_{2k|j+1} \quad (j=0,1,\dots,m-1; k=1,2,\dots,2^j), \quad (2.2)$$



which can be proven by substitution.

Apart from  $\beta_0$ , all regression parameters are assumed to be non-negative. This means that all aggregated parameters are also non-negative, and that for each  $j$  ( $j=0,1,\dots,m$ ) the sequence  $\beta_0, \beta_0+\beta_1|_j, \beta_0+\beta_1|_j+\beta_2|_j, \dots, \beta_0+\beta_1|_j+\beta_2|_j+\dots+\beta_{2^j}|_j$  is non-decreasing. So, if we define

$$\beta_{i|j}^+ := \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^i \beta_{k|j} \quad (i=0,1,\dots,2^j; j=0,1,\dots,m) \quad (2.3)$$

(where  $\sum_{k=1}^0$  is always 0), then the sequence  $\beta_{i|j}^+$  is non-decreasing in  $i$  for each  $j$ . We need one more definition for the parameters, namely

$$\beta_i^+ := \beta_{i|m}^+ = \sum_{k=0}^i \beta_k \quad (i=0,\dots,2^m). \quad (2.4)$$

The SB design is such that all observations have the first  $i$  input variables at their high levels, and the remaining  $N-i$  input variables at their low levels; they are denoted as  $y_i$  ( $i \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}$ ). Because of (2.4), (1.1) and  $e=0$  we have

$$y_i = \beta_i^+ \quad \text{for all observations } y_i. \quad (2.5)$$

We distinguish between  $y_i$  and  $\beta_i^+$  for two reasons. First,  $\beta_i^+$  is defined for all  $i=0,1,\dots,N$ : there are  $N+1$   $\beta_i^+$ 's, whereas we will not need  $N+1$  observations  $y_i$ . Second, when random errors are introduced,  $\beta_i^+$  will be the expectation of  $y_i$ .

Alternatively, we write the observations as  $y_{i|j}$ , in which the input variables in groups  $1|_j, \dots, i|_j$  are at their high levels; the remaining input variables are at their low levels ( $i \in \{0,1,\dots,2^j\}, j \in \{0,1,\dots,m\}$ ). But



the input variables in groups  $1|j, \dots, i|j$  are exactly the input variables  $1, 2, \dots, i \cdot 2^{m-j}$ , so

$$y_{i|j} = y_{i \cdot 2^{m-j}} \quad \text{for all observations.} \quad (2.6)$$

Note that  $y_{i|j} = \beta_{i|j}^+ = \beta_{i \cdot 2^{m-j}}^+ = y_{i \cdot 2^{m-j}}$ . Why do we need so many notations for the same quantity? First of all, the equality between observations and sums of parameters will end as soon as we switch to observations with random errors. The other differences will be clarified presently.

Now suppose we know  $\beta_{i-1|j}^+$  and  $\beta_{i|j}^+$ . Then  $\beta_{i|j} = \beta_{i|j}^+ - \beta_{i-1|j}^+$ . If  $\beta_{i|j} < \delta$ , then none of the parameters in group  $i$  at level  $j$  can exceed  $\delta$ :  $\beta_{(i-1) \cdot 2^{m-j} + 1} < \delta$ ,  $\beta_{(i-1) \cdot 2^{m-j} + 2} < \delta$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\beta_{i \cdot 2^{m-j}} < \delta$ . We do not investigate this group any further. On the other hand, if  $\beta_{i|j} > \delta$ , we distinguish between  $j=m$  and  $j \neq m$ . If  $j=m$ , we have found that  $\beta_i > \delta$ ; so factor number  $i$  is important. If  $j < m$  and  $\beta_{i|j} > \delta$ , then we proceed to the next stage, using (2.2): we investigate whether  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}$  and/or  $\beta_{2i|j+1}$  exceed  $\delta$ . For  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}$  we need  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}^+$  and  $\beta_{2i-2|j+1}^+$ ; for  $\beta_{2i|j+1}$  we need  $\beta_{2i|j+1}^+$  and  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}^+$ .

We already have  $\beta_{2i-2|j+1}^+$  and  $\beta_{2i|j+1}^+$ , as  $\beta_{i|j}^+ = \beta_{i \cdot 2^{m-j}}^+ = \beta_{2i \cdot 2^{m-j-1}}^+ = \beta_{2i|j+1}^+$ , and, in the same way,  $\beta_{i-1|j}^+ = \beta_{2i-2|j+1}^+$ . So all we need is  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}^+$ : we observe  $y_{2i-1|j+1} = \beta_{2i-1|j+1}^+$ , and now we can compute  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}$  and  $\beta_{2i|j+1}$ .

SB always starts with the observation of  $y_{0|0} = \beta_{0|0}^+$  and  $y_{1|0} = \beta_{1|0}^+$ , and continues as described above, starting with  $j=0$ ,  $i=1$ . For the number of observations SB uses, we refer to Bettonvil(1988a,b,c).

*Example 2.1.* Suppose we have 8 factors ( $m=3$ ), with only  $\beta_2 > 0$ . This implies that  $\beta_0^+ = \beta_1^+ < \beta_2^+ = \beta_3^+ = \dots = \beta_8^+$ . Take  $\delta=0$ . SB starts by observing  $y_0|_0 = \beta_0^+|_0 = \beta_0^+$  and  $y_1|_0 = \beta_1^+|_0 = \beta_8^+$ , and computing  $\beta_1|_0 = \beta_1^+|_0 - \beta_0^+|_0$ .

As  $\beta_1|_0 > 0$ , and  $\beta_1|_0 = \beta_1|_1 + \beta_2|_1$ , we observe  $y_1|_1 = \beta_1^+|_1 = \beta_4^+$  and note that  $\beta_0^+|_0 = \beta_0^+|_1 = \beta_0^+$ ,  $\beta_1^+|_0 = \beta_2^+|_1 = \beta_8^+$ . We find that  $\beta_1|_1 = \beta_1^+|_1 - \beta_0^+|_1 > 0$ , and that  $\beta_2|_1 = \beta_2^+|_1 - \beta_1^+|_1 = 0$ . We need not bother about  $\beta_2|_1$ : all its components are zero.

As  $\beta_1|_1 > 0$ , and  $\beta_1|_1 = \beta_1|_2 + \beta_2|_2$ , we observe  $y_1|_2 = \beta_1^+|_2 = \beta_2^+$  and note that  $\beta_0^+|_1 = \beta_0^+|_2 = \beta_0^+$ ,  $\beta_1^+|_1 = \beta_2^+|_2 = \beta_4^+$ . We find that  $\beta_1|_2 = \beta_1^+|_2 - \beta_0^+|_2 > 0$ , and that  $\beta_2|_2 = \beta_2^+|_2 - \beta_1^+|_2 = 0$ . We need not bother about  $\beta_2|_2$ : both its components are zero.

As  $\beta_1|_2 > 0$ , and  $\beta_1|_2 = \beta_1|_3 + \beta_2|_3$ , we observe  $y_1|_3 = \beta_1^+|_3 = \beta_3^+$  and note that  $\beta_0^+|_2 = \beta_0^+|_3 = \beta_0^+$ ,  $\beta_1^+|_2 = \beta_2^+|_3 = \beta_2^+$ . We find that  $\beta_1|_3 = \beta_1^+|_3 - \beta_0^+|_3 = 0$ , and that  $\beta_2|_3 = \beta_2^+|_3 - \beta_1^+|_3 > 0$ , which completes the screening.

### 3. OBSERVATIONS WITH RANDOM ERRORS

From now on, we assume that

$$y_{i|j} = \beta_{i|j}^+ + e_{i|j} \quad (3.1)$$

with  $e_{i|j} \sim \text{NID}(0, \sigma^2)$ ,  $\sigma^2$  known; where  $\text{NID}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  means Normally Independently Distributed with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ . An alternative formulation of (3.1) is

$$y_k = \beta_k^+ + e_k \quad (3.2)$$

where  $k=i*2^{m-j}$ . We want to find the important factors by means of SB.

How do we define "important" in case of random noise? We might concentrate on the probability that a small parameter is found to be significant. Instead we focus on the probability that a large parameter is indeed declared large: power (the complement of the  $\beta$ -error). E.g., consider two confidence intervals, the first running from 1.0 to 2.0, the second from -1.0 to 11.0, and (say) a parameter with magnitude 10.0 is considered to be large; a parameter with confidence interval [1.0,2.0] is then significant but unimportant, while a parameter with confidence interval [-1.0,11.0] is not significant, but may be important. We want our procedure to work such that, if a parameter is at least equal to  $\delta\sigma$  (with given  $\delta>0$ ), then the probability of this parameter being declared unimportant, is at most equal to some given constant  $\epsilon>0$ :  $\beta$  error. Furthermore, we want to minimize the number of observations, as well as the number of parameters that is incorrectly declared important.

In the non-error case we needed  $m+2$  observations to find out that a single factor is important (see appendix 1). However, to find out that a particular input variable is unimportant, we needed at most  $m+2$  (and at least 2) observations. As soon as we obtained a small  $\beta_{k|j}$ , we concluded that all original parameters composing  $\beta_{k|j}$  are small, and we stopped investigating these parameters. If we are dealing with observations with random errors, we proceed analogously. Our decision to declare a factor important, must be based on  $m+2$  observations (and for each single factor we know beforehand which observations we need). The decision to declare a factor unimportant, however, should be based on as few observations as possible.

Consider the  $m+2$  random variables  $y_{i_0}, y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_{m+1}}$  with  $0=i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{m+1}=2^m$ , on which our decision whether or not to declare  $\beta_k$  to

be large (that is, larger than  $\delta\sigma$ ) should be based. When do we accept  $H_0^\ell$ :  $\beta_\ell > \delta\sigma$ ? (Note that this null-hypothesis concerns factor  $\ell$  only.) Of course the observations  $y_{i_0}, y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_{m+1}}$  include  $y_\ell$  and  $y_{\ell-1}$  (see 3.1 and 3.3 with  $j=m$ ). So we might consider  $\hat{\beta}_\ell = y_\ell - y_{\ell-1} = \beta_\ell + e_\ell - e_{\ell-1}$ . Unfortunately, either  $y_\ell$  or  $y_{\ell-1}$  is the last of the  $m+2$  observations that becomes available, that is,  $y_\ell$  or  $y_{\ell-1}$  is an observation at stage  $m$  (for otherwise, we would not need  $m+2$  observations for  $\beta_\ell$ ). This means that, to investigate all factors, we must have  $N+1$  observations ( $2$  at level  $0$ ,  $2^{j-1}$  at level  $j$ ,  $j=1, \dots, m$ ; together  $2 + \sum_{j=1}^m 2^{j-1} = 2 + 2^m - 1 = 2^m + 1 = N+1$ ). The number of observations would be of the same order as the number of factors, which we wanted to avoid. So, we cannot use  $\hat{\beta}_\ell$ .

We take another view of  $y_{i_0}, y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_{m+1}}$ . In observations  $y_0, \dots, y_{\ell-1}$  factor number  $\ell$  is "off" ( $x_\ell=0$ ), in observations  $y_\ell, \dots, y_N$  factor number  $\ell$  is "on" ( $x_\ell=1$ ). Let  $L$  be such that  $i_L = \ell-1$ . We may consider  $y_{i_0}, \dots, y_{i_L}$  as (under)estimators of  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{\ell-1}$ ;  $y_{i_L+1}, \dots, y_{i_{m+1}}$  as (over)estimators of  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{\ell-1} + \beta_\ell$ . Hence, the  $(L+1) \cdot (m-L+1)$  differences  $y_{i_+} - y_{i_-}$  with  $i_+ \in \{i_L+1, \dots, i_{m+1}\}$  and  $i_- \in \{i_0, \dots, i_L\}$  are all (over)estimators of  $\beta_\ell$ .

*Example 3.1.* Suppose we are dealing with  $2^3=8$  factors. To arrive at  $\beta_2$  we observe  $y_{0|0}=y_0$ ,  $y_{1|0}=y_8$ ,  $y_{1|1}=y_4$ ,  $y_{1|2}=y_2$  and  $y_{1|3}=y_1$  and consider successively

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_1|0 &= y_{1|0} - y_{0|0} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7 + \beta_8 + e_{1|0} - e_{0|0}; \\ \hat{\beta}_1|1 &= y_{1|1} - y_{0|0} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + e_{1|1} - e_{0|0}; \\ \hat{\beta}_1|2 &= y_{1|2} - y_{0|0} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + e_{1|2} - e_{0|0}; \\ \hat{\beta}_2|3 &= y_{1|2} - y_{1|3} = \beta_2 + e_{1|2} - e_{1|3}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the minimum of these four (over)estimators of  $\beta_2$ :

$$\min\{y_1|_0 - y_0|_0, y_1|_1 - y_0|_0, y_1|_2 - y_0|_0, y_1|_2 - y_1|_3\} =$$

$$\min\{\beta_2 + e_1|_0 - e_0|_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7 + \beta_8,$$

$$\beta_2 + e_1|_1 - e_0|_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4,$$

$$\beta_2 + e_1|_2 - e_0|_0 + \beta_1,$$

$$\beta_2 + e_1|_2 - e_1|_3\} \geq$$

$$\beta_2 + \min\{e_1|_0 - e_0|_0, e_1|_1 - e_0|_0, e_1|_2 - e_0|_0, e_1|_2 - e_1|_3\} \geq$$

$$\beta_2 + \min\{e_1|_0 - e_0|_0, e_1|_0 - e_1|_3, e_1|_1 - e_0|_0, e_1|_1 - e_1|_3, e_1|_2 - e_0|_0, e_1|_2 - e_1|_3\} =$$

$$\beta_2 + \min\{e_1|_0, e_1|_1, e_1|_2\} - \max\{e_0|_0, e_1|_3\}.$$

If we know the distribution of  $\min\{e_1|_0, e_1|_1, e_1|_2\} - \max\{e_0|_0, e_1|_3\}$ , then we have a rule to decide whether or not  $\beta_2$  is large. Note that  $e_1|_0, e_1|_1, e_1|_2, e_0|_0, e_1|_3$  are independent. We shall return to this distribution.

In general we have  $m+2$  observations available for each  $\beta_\lambda$ . Of these observations,  $L+1$  do not contain  $\beta_\lambda$ , and  $m-L+1$  do contain  $\beta_\lambda$ . We consider the  $m+1$  differences  $\hat{\beta}_1|_0 := y_{i_{m+1}} - y_{i_0}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_\lambda|_m := y_\lambda - y_{\lambda-1}$ , corresponding with the  $m+1$  aggregated parameters, that  $\beta_\lambda$  belongs to:  $\beta_1|_0 = \beta_1^+|_0 - \beta_0^+|_0, \dots, \beta_\lambda|_m = \beta_\lambda^+|_m - \beta_{\lambda-1}^+|_m$ . The minimum of these differences is greater than

$$\beta_\lambda + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}, e_{i_m}, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}\} - \max\{e_{i_L}, \dots, e_{i_0}\}, \quad (3.3)$$

and, as is shown in appendix 2, this is greater than

$$\beta_\lambda - \sigma \wedge_0 \quad \text{with probability } p_0 \quad (3.4)$$



where the relation between  $p_0$  and  $\Lambda_0$  is given by table I in Bechhofer (1954). We reproduce a small part of Bechhofer's table I in our table 3.1. The table entries record the values  $\Lambda_0$  for which

$$P(\wedge_0 + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}, e_{i_m}, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}\} - \max\{e_{i_L}, \dots, e_{i_0}\} < 0) = p_0,$$

for  $m=3$ ,  $L=0,1,2,3$ ; and for  $m=8$ ,  $L=0,\dots,9$ , and  $p_0=.9995$ ,  $.995$ , and  $.95$ .

```

*****
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*****

```

As soon as a  $\hat{\beta}_{i|j}$  is smaller than  $\sigma(\delta - \Lambda_0)$ , all parameters composing  $\beta_{i|j}$  are smaller than  $\delta\sigma$  with probability  $1 - p_0$ .

Example 3.3. In example 3.2 we had 8 factors, and we were interested in  $\beta_2$ . We saw that

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_2^{+\min\{e_1|0, e_1|1, e_3|3\}-\max\{e_0|0, e_1|2\}} \leq \\ & \leq \min\{y_1|0^{-y_0|0}, y_1|1^{-y_0|0}, y_1|1^{-y_1|2}, y_3|3^{-y_1|2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we want to find all factors that are greater than  $10\sigma$  with probability of at least .95 (that is,  $\delta=10$ ,  $\epsilon=0.05$ ). We have a set of 5 random variables, subdivided into sets of 2 and 3 variables. From Bechhofer's (1954) table I it follows that

$$P(3.2805 + \min\{e_{1|0}/\sigma, e_{1|1}/\sigma, e_{3|3}/\sigma\} - \max\{e_{0|0}/\sigma, e_{1|2}/\sigma\} > 0) = .95.$$

So we stop as soon as any of  $y_{1|0} - y_{0|0}$ ,  $y_{1|1} - y_{0|0}$ ,  $y_{1|1} - y_{1|2}$ ,  $y_{3|3} - y_{1|2}$  is smaller than  $(10 - 3.2805)\sigma = 6.7195\sigma$ .

We used a number of Monte-Carlo experiments to investigate the behaviour of the above procedure. We took  $N=256$  variables ( $m=8$ ),  $\sigma^2=1$ , and investigated the following cases:

- (a)  $\beta_1 = \delta$ , all other parameters zero;
- (b)  $\beta_{86} = \delta$ , all other parameters zero;
- (c)  $\beta_{241} = \delta$ , all other parameters zero;
- (d) all parameters zero.

(Note: for  $\beta_1$  we always take the "left branch in the bifurcation tree"; for  $\beta_{86}$  we go left, right, left, right, etc.; for  $\beta_{241}$  we go four times right, then four times left. By considering these parameters, we may get an impression of the influence of the "path" we follow).

We took  $\epsilon = .05, .005, .0005$ ;  $\delta = 10, 8, 6, 4$ , and repeated all  $4 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 = 48$  experiments 1,000 times. We recorded the number of times the large parameter was (correctly) found, the number of times any other parameter was (incorrectly) found, and the total number of observations. To facilitate the



comparability of the experiments, we made them all use the same random number stream (i.e. each experiment used the same seed for the random number generator). The results are shown in tables 3.2.1 through 3.2.4.

```

*****
*
*
*      tables 3.2.1 through 3.2.4 about here
*
*
*
*****

```

From tables 3.2.1 through 3.2.4 we learn the following.

- (1) The prescribed power is reached in all cases: where we expect .95 we find .954, .962, and .951; where we expect .995 we find .993, .997, and .994; and where we expect .9995 we find 1.000.
- (2) The experimental  $\alpha$ -error (the number of incorrectly found small parameters, divided by the number of small parameters) ranges from 0.0 to .41; this maximum is reached in the experiment with  $\beta_{86}=4$ ,  $\epsilon=.0005$ . The latter result may be regarded as inadmissible. Let us see what happened. According to our procedure, we stop investigating a branch in the bifurcation tree, when the difference between the minimum upper estimate and the maximum lower estimate is smaller than  $\sigma(\delta-x)$ , where  $x$  is given by Bechhofer's (1954) table I. For  $\epsilon=.0005$  this table has entries ranging from 5.4432 to 5.7924; see our table 3.1. Now we have the situation that  $x > \delta$  for  $\delta=4$ , so we go on investigating, even when the minimum upper estimate is

smaller than the maximum lower estimate, e.g. when  $y_N < y_0$ . If we want to avoid this peculiar situation, we have to demand that  $x \leq \delta$ , and by doing so, we introduce a relation between  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$ , via Bechhofer's table I. If for  $\delta=4$  we demand that  $x \geq 4$ , we drop the experiments  $\delta=4, \epsilon=.0005$  and  $\delta=4, \epsilon=.005$ , and then the maximum experimental  $\alpha$ -error is  $4.418/255=.017$  for  $\beta_{86}=\delta=4, \epsilon=.05$ .

(3) The number of runs is extremely small. Notice that if there were no noise, then we would need two observations to find out that no factor is important; we would need  $m+2=10$  observations to find out that one factor is important. If we drop the experiments  $\delta=4, \epsilon=.0005$  and  $\delta=4, \epsilon=.005$ , then the number of experiments in case all effect parameters are zero, ranges from 2.0 to 9.6; in case of one important parameter the number of experiments ranges from 9.9 to 26.4. One might wonder how it is possible that with one important variable the number of observations is less than 10. Note that this only occurs for  $\epsilon_1=.05$ , where in 95% of the cases we must find the important factor (and use 10 observations), in 5% of the cases we may find no important factors (and might use only two observations). The mean minimum number of observations is then  $0.95*10 + 0.05*2 = 9.6$ .

(4) The case  $\beta_1=\delta$  is treated slightly more efficient than  $\beta_{86}=\delta$  and  $\beta_{241}=\delta$ , from the viewpoint of experimental  $\alpha$ -error and number of observations.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Sequential Bifurcation is not only a very efficient tool for factor screening in the absence of random error; it is also capable of coping with

observations with random errors in a very efficient way. This efficiency depends on the signal-to-noise ratio.

No attention is yet paid to questions such as: how does SB handle

- numbers of input variables not equal to some power of two;
- small negative factor effects;
- normally distributed error with unknown variance;
- non-normally distributed error.

Research on these topics is to going on.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Jack Kleijnen en Peter Sander for our fruitful discussions, and to S.S. Gupta, who pointed out the possibility of adopting Bechhofer's method to our problem.

#### APPENDIX 1: THE OBSERVATIONS GOING WITH A PARTICULAR FACTOR

Suppose that, in the deterministic case, factor number  $\ell$ , say, is important.

At each stage of the procedure exactly one aggregated parameter contains  $\beta_\ell$ :

$\beta_i | j (= \sum_{k=(i-1)*2^{m-j}+1}^{i*2^{m-j}} \beta_k)$  contains  $\beta_\ell$  iff  $(i-1)*2^{m-j} < \ell \leq i*2^{m-j}$ . As there are  $N=2^m$  factors, we have  $1 \leq \ell \leq 2^m$ , and the binary form of  $\ell-1$  uses  $m$  digits:

$$\ell - 1 = \sum_{t=1}^m \ell_t 2^{m-t} \quad \text{with } \ell_t \in \{0,1\}, t=1, \dots, m. \quad (\text{A1.1})$$

For any  $j \in \{0,1, \dots, m\}$  we can write

$$\ell = 2^{m-j} * \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t} + \sum_{t=j+1}^m \ell_t 2^{m-j} + 1. \quad (\text{A1.2})$$

Group  $i$  at stage  $j$  contains the input variables with numbers  $(i-1)*2^{m-j+1}$  through  $i*2^{m-j}$ , so it contains factor number  $\ell$  iff  $i-1 = \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t}$ ;  $\beta_{i|j}$  contains  $\beta_\ell$  iff  $i = 1 + \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t}$  ( $j=0,1, \dots, m$ ). Examples: take  $j=0$ , then  $i=1$ ; take  $j=m$ , then  $i=\ell$ .

To arrive at  $\beta_{1|0}$  we use observations  $y_{0|0}$  and  $y_{1|0}$ . Be  $0 \leq j < m$ , and suppose  $\beta_{i|j}$  contains  $\beta_\ell$ . Then either  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}$  or  $\beta_{2i|j+1}$  contains  $\beta_\ell$ . To split  $\beta_{i|j}$  into  $\beta_{2i-1|j+1}$  and  $\beta_{2i|j+1}$  we use observation  $y_{2i-1|j+1}$ . Now  $i = 1 + \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t}$ , so  $2i-1 = 1 + 2 \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t}$ . According to (2.6),  $y_{i|j} = y_{i*2^{m-j}}$ , so  $y_{2i-1|j+1} = y_{(2i-1)*2^{m-j-1}} = y_{(1+2 \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t})*2^{m-j-1}}$ . To arrive at  $\beta_\ell$  we use the observations

$$y_0, y_N, \text{ and } y_{(1+2 \sum_{t=1}^j \ell_t 2^{j-t})*2^{m-j-1}}, \quad j=0,1, \dots, m-1, \quad (\text{A1.3})$$

where the numbers  $\ell_t$  ( $t=1, \dots, m$ ) are defined by (A1.1).

*Example A1.* Take  $m=3$ ;  $N=8$ . To arrive at  $\beta_2$  we need the following observations:

at level 0 we use  $\beta_{1|0}^+ = y_{1|0} = y_8$  and  $\beta_{0|0}^+ = y_{0|0} = y_0$  to compute  $\beta_{1|0}$ ;

at level 1 we use  $\beta_{1|1}^+ = y_{1|1} = y_4$  and  $\beta_{0|1}^+ = \beta_{0|0}^+ = y_{0|0} = y_0$  for  $\beta_{1|1}$ ;

at level 2 we use  $\beta_{1|2}^+ = y_{1|2} = y_2$  and  $\beta_{0|2}^+ = \beta_{0|1}^+ = y_{0|1} = y_0$  for  $\beta_{1|2}$ ;

at level 3 we use  $\beta_2^+|_3=\beta_1^+|_2=y_1|_2=y_2$  and  $\beta_1^+|_3=y_1|_3=y_1$  for  $\beta_2|_3=\beta_3$ .

At each of the four levels we use two observations. In total, however, we do not use  $4*2=8$  observations, but only  $(m+2)=5$ , namely  $y_0, y_1, y_2, y_4$  and  $y_8$ .

We see that, no matter how many observations the whole screening uses,  $m+2$  observations, specified by (A1.3), are used for a particular important factor. For a particular unimportant factor at most  $m+2$  observations are used: the observations of (A1.3) are used until we reach a stage, where the aggregated parameter, the particular parameter is part of, is small. This may be level 0 (and then we use only two observations for all factors), but if we are unlucky, this can be level  $m$ .

## APPENDIX 2: THE DISTRIBUTION OF UPPER LIMITS

Bechhofer (1954) considers  $k$  normal populations with common variance  $\sigma^2$ , and computes the probability that, after taking a sample of size  $N$  from each population and ordering the sample means, the  $t$  populations with the largest sample means correspond with the  $t$  populations with the largest population means. This probability depends on  $k, t$  and  $\sqrt{N}\lambda$ , where  $\lambda=(\mu_t-\mu_{t+1})/\sigma$  ( $\mu_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  largest population mean). In the sequel we shall use the symbol  $\Lambda$  instead of  $\sqrt{N}\lambda$ . For  $k=2, \dots, 10, t=1, \dots, [k/2]$  (the problem is symmetric in  $t$  and  $k-t$ ) as well as  $k=11, \dots, 15$  and some selected values of  $t$ , Bechhofer tabulates  $\Lambda$  against the probability of correct ranking:

$$P(\min\{x_1, \dots, x_t\} > \max\{x_{t+1}, \dots, x_k\})$$



$$| \min\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_t\} - \max\{\mu_{t+1}, \dots, \mu_k\} | \geq \lambda \sigma \text{ \& } \forall x_i = \sigma^2/N \text{ (} i=1, \dots, k \text{))}. \quad (\text{A2.1})$$

By multiplying all variables by  $\sqrt{N}/\sigma$ , we see that (A2.1) is equal to

$$P(\min\{x_1, \dots, x_t\} - \max\{x_{t+1}, \dots, x_k\} > 0 \mid \min\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_t\} - \max\{\mu_{t+1}, \dots, \mu_k\} \geq \lambda \text{ \& } \forall x_i = 1 \text{ (} i=1, \dots, k \text{))}. \quad (\text{A2.2})$$

The least favorable configuration is the one with  $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_t$  and  $\mu_{t+1} = \dots = \mu_k$ , and we may take  $x_i = \wedge + e_i$  ( $i=1, \dots, t$ );  $x_i = e_i$  ( $i=t+1, \dots, k$ ), and replace (A2.2) by

$$P(\wedge + \min\{e_1, \dots, e_t\} - \max\{e_{t+1}, \dots, e_k\} > 0 \mid \forall e_i = 1 \text{ (} i=1, \dots, k \text{))}. \quad (\text{A2.3})$$

As said, this probability is tabulated against  $\wedge$ . Now we consider (3.3):

$$\beta_{\ell} + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}\} - \max\{e_{i_L}, \dots, e_{i_0}\}, \quad (\text{A2.4})$$

where  $e_{i_0}, \dots, e_{i_{m+1}}$  are  $\text{NID}(0, \sigma^2)$ . (A2.4) equals

$$\beta_{\ell} - \sigma \wedge + \sigma (\wedge + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}/\sigma, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}/\sigma\} - \max\{e_{i_L}/\sigma, \dots, e_{i_0}/\sigma\}). \quad (\text{A2.5})$$

The value  $\wedge_0$  for which  $\wedge + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}/\sigma, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}/\sigma\} - \max\{e_{i_L}/\sigma, \dots, e_{i_0}/\sigma\} > 0$  with probability  $p_0$  can be found in Bechhofer's table I, where for  $k$  we take  $m+2$ , and for  $t$  we take  $\min\{L+1, m-L+1\}$ . So now we have

$$\beta_{\ell} + \min\{e_{i_{m+1}}, \dots, e_{i_{L+1}}\} - \max\{e_{i_L}, \dots, e_{i_0}\} > \beta_{\ell} - \sigma \wedge_0 \quad \text{wp } p_0. \quad (\text{A2.6})$$

## REFERENCES

- Bechhofer, R.E. (1954), "A Single-Sample Multiple Decision Procedure for Ranking Means of Normal Populations with Known Variances", *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 25, 16-39.
- Bettonvil, B. (1988a), "Sequential Bifurcation for Factor Screening", in *Operations Research Proceedings 1987*, eds. H.Schellhaas, P.van Beek, H.Iserman, R.Schmidt and M.Zijlstra, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 444-450.
- Bettonvil, B. (1988b), "Factor Screening by Sequential Bifurcation", submitted for publication.
- Bettonvil, B. (1988c), "Sequential Bifurcation: the Design of a Factor Screening Method", submitted for publication.
- Jacoby, J.E. and Harrison, S. (1962), "Multi-Variable Experimentation and Simulation Models", *Naval Research Logistic Quarterly*, 9, 121-136.
- Kleijnen, J.P.C. (1987), *Statistical Tools for Simulation Practitioners*, New York: Marcel Dekker.



Table 3.1. Limit values for various group sizes  $2^m$  and probabilities  $p_0$ 

| $p_0$ | $m=3$<br>$L=0, L=3$ | $m=3$<br>$L=1, L=2$ | $m=8$<br>$L=0, L=9$ | $m=8$<br>$L=1, L=8$ | $m=8$<br>$L=2, L=7$ | $m=8$<br>$L=3, L=6$ | $m=8$<br>$L=4, L=5$ |
|-------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| .9995 | 5.1661              | 5.3127              | 5.4432              | 5.6425              | 5.7343              | 5.7788              | 5.7924              |
| .995  | 4.2394              | 4.4138              | 4.5524              | 4.7878              | 4.8950              | 4.9468              | 4.9625              |
| .95   | 3.0552              | 3.2805              | 3.4182              | 3.7198              | 3.8541              | 3.9184              | 3.9378              |

(Source: Bechhofer 1954, p. 30-34)

Table 3.2.1. Performance of SB with  $\beta_1 = \delta$ .

|               | Power (1)        |                   |                    | $\alpha$ -error times 255 (2) |                   |                    | Observations (3) |                   |                    |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|               | $\epsilon = .05$ | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ | $\epsilon = .05$              | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ | $\epsilon = .05$ | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ |
| $\delta = 10$ | .954             | .993              | 1.000              | .000                          | .000              | .000               | 9.9              | 10.0              | 10.0               |
| $\delta = 8$  | .954             | .993              | 1.000              | .000                          | .000              | .005               | 9.9              | 10.0              | 10.2               |
| $\delta = 6$  | .954             | .993              | 1.000              | .007                          | .150              | 2.038              | 10.2             | 12.1              | 19.9               |
| $\delta = 4$  | .954             | .993              | 1.000              | 2.831                         | 30.673            | 97.243             | 22.4             | 68.9              | 138.5              |

(1) Average number of times  $\beta_1$  is found; experimental power.

(2) Average number of incorrectly found parameters; the experimental  $\alpha$ -error is this number divided by 255 (the number of unimportant factors).

(3) Average number of observations.

Table 3.2.2. Performance of SB with  $\beta_{86}=\delta$ .

|             | Power (1)      |                 |                  | $\alpha$ -error times 255 (2) |                 |                  | Observations (3) |                 |                  |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|             | $\epsilon=.05$ | $\epsilon=.005$ | $\epsilon=.0005$ | $\epsilon=.05$                | $\epsilon=.005$ | $\epsilon=.0005$ | $\epsilon=.05$   | $\epsilon=.005$ | $\epsilon=.0005$ |
| $\delta=10$ | .962           | .997            | 1.000            | .000                          | .000            | .000             | 9.9              | 10.0            | 10.0             |
| $\delta=8$  | .962           | .997            | 1.000            | .000                          | .002            | .016             | 9.9              | 10.0            | 10.3             |
| $\delta=6$  | .962           | .997            | 1.000            | .019                          | .377            | 3.217            | 10.3             | 13.1            | 23.3             |
| $\delta=4$  | .962           | .997            | 1.000            | 4.418                         | 36.523          | 105.366          | 26.4             | 77.1            | 146.9            |

(1) Average number of times  $\beta_{86}$  is found; experimental power.

(2) Average number of incorrectly found parameters; the experimental  $\alpha$ -error is this number divided by 255 (the number of unimportant factors).

(3) Average number of observations.

Table 3.2.3. Performance of SB with  $\beta_{241} = \delta$ .

|               | Power (1)        |                   |                    | $\alpha$ -error times 255 (2) |                   |                    | Observations (3) |                   |                    |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|               | $\epsilon = .05$ | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ | $\epsilon = .05$              | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ | $\epsilon = .05$ | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ |
| $\delta = 10$ | .951             | .994              | 1.000              | .000                          | .000              | .000               | 9.9              | 10.0              | 10.0               |
| $\delta = 8$  | .951             | .994              | 1.000              | .000                          | .002              | .018               | 9.9              | 10.0              | 10.3               |
| $\delta = 6$  | .951             | .994              | 1.000              | .028                          | .397              | 2.921              | 10.3             | 12.9              | 21.1               |
| $\delta = 4$  | .951             | .994              | 1.000              | 3.810                         | 31.941            | 97.725             | 23.7             | 68.8              | 138.0              |

- (1) Average number of times  $\beta_{241}$  is found; experimental power.
- (2) Average number of incorrectly found parameters; the experimental  $\alpha$ -error is this number divided by 255 (the number of unimportant factors).
- (3) Average number of observations.

Table 3.2.4. Performance of SB with  $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_{256} = 0$ .

|               | $\alpha$ -error times 256 (2) |                   |                    | Observations (3) |                   |                    |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|               | $\epsilon = .05$              | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ | $\epsilon = .05$ | $\epsilon = .005$ | $\epsilon = .0005$ |
| $\delta = 10$ | .000                          | .000              | .000               | 2.0              | 2.0               | 2.0                |
| $\delta = 8$  | .000                          | .000              | .001               | 2.0              | 2.0               | 2.1                |
| $\delta = 6$  | .001                          | .032              | .759               | 2.2              | 3.1               | 7.7                |
| $\delta = 4$  | 1.135                         | 20.168            | 80.849             | 9.6              | 46.0              | 116.6              |

(2) Average number of incorrectly found parameters; the experimental  $\alpha$ -error is this number divided by 256 (the number of unimportant factors).

(3) Average number of observations.

## IN 1988 REEDS VERSCHENEN

- 297 Bert Bettonvil  
Factor screening by sequential bifurcation
- 298 Robert P. Gilles  
On perfect competition in an economy with a coalitional structure
- 299 Willem Selen, Ruud M. Heuts  
Capacitated Lot-Size Production Planning in Process Industry
- 300 J. Kriens, J.Th. van Lieshout  
Notes on the Markowitz portfolio selection method
- 301 Bert Bettonvil, Jack P.C. Kleijnen  
Measurement scales and resolution IV designs: a note
- 302 Theo Nijman, Marno Verbeek  
Estimation of time dependent parameters in linear models  
using cross sections, panels or both
- 303 Raymond H.J.M. Gradus  
A differential game between government and firms: a non-cooperative  
approach
- 304 Leo W.G. Strijbosch, Ronald J.M.M. Does  
Comparison of bias-reducing methods for estimating the parameter in  
dilution series
- 305 Drs. W.J. Reijnders, Drs. W.F. Verstappen  
Strategische bespiegelingen betreffende het Nederlandse kwaliteits-  
concept
- 306 J.P.C. Kleijnen, J. Kriens, H. Timmermans and H. Van den Wildenberg  
Regression sampling in statistical auditing
- 307 Isolde Woittiez, Arie Kapteyn  
A Model of Job Choice, Labour Supply and Wages
- 308 Jack P.C. Kleijnen  
Simulation and optimization in production planning: A case study
- 309 Robert P. Gilles and Pieter H.M. Ruys  
Relational constraints in coalition formation
- 310 Drs. H. Leo Theuns  
Determinanten van de vraag naar vakantiereizen: een verkenning van  
materiële en immateriële factoren
- 311 Peter M. Kort  
Dynamic Firm Behaviour within an Uncertain Environment
- 312 J.P.C. Blanc  
A numerical approach to cyclic-service queueing models

- 313 Drs. N.J. de Beer, Drs. A.M. van Nunen, Drs. M.O. Nijkamp  
Does Morkmon Matter?
- 314 Th. van de Klundert  
Wage differentials and employment in a two-sector model with a dual  
labour market
- 315 Aart de Zeeuw, Fons Groot, Cees Withagen  
On Credible Optimal Tax Rate Policies
- 316 Christian B. Mulder  
Wage moderating effects of corporatism  
Decentralized versus centralized wage setting in a union, firm,  
government context
- 317 Jörg Glombowski, Michael Krüger  
A short-period Goodwin growth cycle
- 318 Theo Nijman, Marno Verbeek, Arthur van Soest  
The optimal design of rotating panels in a simple analysis of  
variance model
- 319 Drs. S.V. Hannema, Drs. P.A.M. Versteijne  
De toepassing en toekomst van public private partnership's bij de  
grote en middelgrote Nederlandse gemeenten
- 320 Th. van de Klundert  
Wage Rigidity, Capital Accumulation and Unemployment in a Small Open  
Economy
- 321 M.H.C. Paardekooper  
An upper and a lower bound for the distance of a manifold to a nearby  
point
- 322 Th. ten Raa, F. van der Ploeg  
A statistical approach to the problem of negatives in input-output  
analysis
- 323 P. Kooreman  
Household Labor Force Participation as a Cooperative Game; an Empiri-  
cal Model
- 324 A.B.T.M. van Schaik  
Persistent Unemployment and Long Run Growth
- 325 Dr. F.W.M. Boekema, Drs. L.A.G. Oerlemans  
De lokale produktiestructuur doorgelicht.  
Bedrijfstakverkenningen ten behoeve van regionaal-economisch onder-  
zoek
- 326 J.P.C. Kleijnen, J. Kriens, M.C.H.M. Lafleur, J.H.F. Pardoel  
Sampling for quality inspection and correction: AOQL performance  
criteria



- 327 Theo E. Nijman, Mark F.J. Steel  
Exclusion restrictions in instrumental variables equations
- 328 B.B. van der Genugten  
Estimation in linear regression under the presence of heteroskedasticity of a completely unknown form
- 329 Raymond H.J.M. Gradus  
The employment policy of government: to create jobs or to let them create?
- 330 Hans Kremers, Dolf Talman  
Solving the nonlinear complementarity problem with lower and upper bounds
- 331 Antoon van den Elzen  
Interpretation and generalization of the Lemke-Howson algorithm
- 332 Jack P.C. Kleijnen  
Analyzing simulation experiments with common random numbers, part II: Rao's approach
- 333 Jacek Osiewalski  
Posterior and Predictive Densities for Nonlinear Regression. A Partly Linear Model Case
- 334 A.H. van den Elzen, A.J.J. Talman  
A procedure for finding Nash equilibria in bi-matrix games
- 335 Arthur van Soest  
Minimum wage rates and unemployment in The Netherlands
- 336 Arthur van Soest, Peter Kooreman, Arie Kapteyn  
Coherent specification of demand systems with corner solutions and endogenous regimes
- 337 Dr. F.W.M. Boekema, Drs. L.A.G. Oerlemans  
De lokale produktiestructuur doorgelicht II. Bedrijfstakverkenningen ten behoeve van regionaal-economisch onderzoek. De zeescheepsnieuw-  
bouwindustrie
- 338 Gerard J. van den Berg  
Search behaviour, transitions to nonparticipation and the duration of unemployment
- 339 W.J.H. Groenendaal and J.W.A. Vingerhoets  
The new cocoa-agreement analysed
- 340 Drs. F.G. van den Heuvel, Drs. M.P.H. de Vor  
Kwantificering van ombuigen en bezuinigen op collectieve uitgaven 1977-1990
- 341 Pieter J.F.G. Meulendijks  
An exercise in welfare economics (III)

- 342 W.J. Selen and R.M. Heuts  
A modified priority index for Günther's lot-sizing heuristic under capacitated single stage production
- 343 Linda J. Mittermaier, Willem J. Selen, Jeri B. Waggoner, Wallace R. Wood  
Accounting estimates as cost inputs to logistics models
- 344 Remy L. de Jong, Rashid I. Al Layla, Willem J. Selen  
Alternative water management scenarios for Saudi Arabia
- 345 W.J. Selen and R.M. Heuts  
Capacitated Single Stage Production Planning with Storage Constraints and Sequence-Dependent Setup Times
- 346 Peter Kort  
The Flexible Accelerator Mechanism in a Financial Adjustment Cost Model
- 347 W.J. Reijnders en W.F. Verstappen  
De toenemende importantie van het verticale marketing systeem
- 348 P.C. van Batenburg en J. Kriens  
E.O.Q.L. - A revised and improved version of A.O.Q.L.
- 349 Drs. W.P.C. van den Nieuwenhof  
Multinationalisatie en coördinatie  
De internationale strategie van Nederlandse ondernemingen nader beschouwd
- 350 K.A. Bubshait, W.J. Selen  
Estimation of the relationship between project attributes and the implementation of engineering management tools
- 351 M.P. Tummers, I. Woittiez  
A simultaneous wage and labour supply model with hours restrictions
- 352 Marco Versteijne  
Measuring the effectiveness of advertising in a positioning context with multi dimensional scaling techniques
- 353 Dr. F. Boekema, Drs. L. Oerlemans  
Innovatie en stedelijke economische ontwikkeling
- 354 J.M. Schumacher  
Discrete events: perspectives from system theory
- 355 F.C. Bussemaker, W.H. Haemers, R. Mathon and H.A. Wilbrink  
A (49,16,3,6) strongly regular graph does not exist
- 356 Drs. J.C. Caanen  
Tien jaar inflatieneutrale belastingheffing door middel van vermogensaftrek en voorraadaftrek: een kwantitatieve benadering

- 357 R.M. Heuts, M. Bronckers  
A modified coordinated reorder procedure under aggregate investment  
and service constraints using optimal policy surfaces
- 358 B.B. van der Genugten  
Linear time-invariant filters of infinite order for non-stationary  
processes
- 359 J.C. Engwerda  
LQ-problem: the discrete-time time-varying case
- 360 Shan-Hwei Nienhuys-Cheng  
Constraints in binary semantical networks
- 361 A.B.T.M. van Schaik  
Interregional Propagation of Inflationary Shocks
- 362 F.C. Drost  
How to define UMVU
- 363 Rommert J. Casimir  
Infogame users manual  
Rev 1.2 December 1988
- 364 M.H.C. Paardekooper  
A quadratically convergent parallel Jacobi-process for diagonal  
dominant matrices with nondistinct eigenvalues
- 365 Robert P. Gilles, Pieter H.M. Ruys  
Characterization of Economic Agents in Arbitrary Communication  
Structures
- 366 Harry H. Tigelaar  
Informative sampling in a multivariate linear system disturbed by  
moving average noise
- 367 Jörg Glombowski  
Cyclical interactions of politics and economics in an abstract  
capitalist economy

## IN 1989 REEDS VERSCHENEN

- 368 Ed Nijssen, Will Reijnders  
"Macht als strategisch en tactisch marketinginstrument binnen de distributieketen"
- 369 Raymond Gradus  
Optimal dynamic taxation with respect to firms
- 370 Theo Nijman  
The optimal choice of controls and pre-experimental observations
- 371 Robert P. Gilles, Pieter H.M. Ruys  
Relational constraints in coalition formation
- 372 F.A. van der Duyn Schouten, S.G. Vanneste  
Analysis and computation of  $(n,N)$ -strategies for maintenance of a two-component system
- 373 Drs. R. Hamers, Drs. P. Verstappen  
Het company ranking model: a means for evaluating the competition
- 374 Rommert J. Casimir  
Infogame Final Report
- 375 Christian B. Mulder  
Efficient and inefficient institutional arrangements between governments and trade unions; an explanation of high unemployment, corporatism and union bashing
- 376 Marno Verbeek  
On the estimation of a fixed effects model with selective non-response
- 377 J. Engwerda  
Admissible target paths in economic models
- 378 Jack P.C. Kleijnen and Nabil Adams  
Pseudorandom number generation on supercomputers
- 379 J.P.C. Blanc  
The power-series algorithm applied to the shortest-queue model
- 380 Prof. Dr. Robert Bannink  
Management's information needs and the definition of costs, with special regard to the cost of interest
- 381 Bert Bettonvil  
Sequential bifurcation: the design of a factor screening method

Bibliotheek K. U. Brabant



17 000 01065998 6